UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSEPH JOHNSON,

No. C 05-1628 SI (pr)

Plaintiff,

ORDER SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE

v.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY; et al.,

Defendants.

Defendant Bernal filed a motion to dismiss this action on January 30, 2007. The court now sets the following briefing schedule on defendant Bernal's motion to dismiss: Plaintiff must file and serve his opposition to the motion to dismiss no later than **March 2, 2007**. Defendant Bernal must file his reply brief (if any) no later than **March 23, 2007**.

The court file discloses a problem with the parties' service of documents on other parties. Defendant Bernal served a copy of his motion on plaintiff but not on defendant Hey, defendant Hey served a copy of his answer on plaintiff but not on defendant Bernal, and plaintiff did not serve a copy of his motion for default on any defendant. The non-service by defendants appears to be due to the fact that the defendants are represented by different attorneys and may not have been aware of each other's appearance in this action. Whatever the cause of the problem, the problem needs to come to an end. From this point forward, every document a party files must be served on every other party (or his attorney if represented by an attorney). Additionally, every

document filed must have attached to it a proof of service showing that every other party in the action has been served with a copy of that document. It does not matter whether the filing affects another party – once a party has appeared in this action, he is entitled to a copy of each document filed by every other party.

Plaintiff is reminded that the January 26, 2007 deadline for him to serve process on each and every defendant and file proof that he has accomplished the service remains in place. See Sep. 26, 2006 Order Re. Service Of Process, pp. 1-2.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 1, 2007

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge